1		STATE OF MICHIGAN
2	DEI	PARTMENT OF LABOR AND ECONOMIC GROWTH
3	OFFICE	E OF FINANCIAL AND INSURANCE REGULATION
4		
5		
6	AUTO	MOBILE INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY HEARING
7		
8		Northern Michigan University
9		602 Cohodas Administrative Center
10	ľ	Monday, November 24, 2008, 4:00 p.m.
11		
12	APPEARANCES:	
13	Hearing Panel:	MR. MELVIN BUTCH HOLLOWELL, CHAIR
		State Insurance Consumer Advocate
14		MR. KENNETH L. ROSS, CO-CHAIR
		State Insurance Commissioner
15		MR. MARK GAFFNEY
		President, Michigan AFL-CIO
16		
17		
18		
	RECORDED BY:	Ruth A. Forgette, CER 3007
19		Certified Electronic Recorder
		Network Reporting Corporation
20		1-800-632-2720
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3		
	Opening of the Hearing by Mr. Hollowell	. 3
4	Overview of the No Fault Insurance by Mr. Hollowell .	. 7
5		
	HEARING TESTIMONY:	
6		
	MR. SCOTT HUMMEL, Industry Expert	. 12
7	MR. BIRNEY BIRNBAUM, Consumer Expert	. 29
	(Statement read by Ms. Fran Wallace)	
8		
	PUBLIC TESTIMONY:	
9		
	DAVID ROBERT SMITH	. 39
10	CHERYL SHERONY	. 47
	NORA CARDINAL	. 52
11	DR. BRUCE RUBEN	. 55
	BRUCE SHERONY	. 63
12	JASON THEODOROFF	. 68
	KEN JUDGE	. 72
13	JOHN CORNACK	. 73
14	Announcement of Results of Audience Poll	. 84
	Adjournment of the Hearing by Mr. Hollowell	. 86
15		
16	EXHIBIT INDEX	
	1	PAGE
17		
	Exhibit 1 marked	. 3
18	(Written testimony of Phillip Muccio, CPO	
	President/Founder Bioflex, Inc.)	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Marquette, Michi
--------------------

2 Monday, November 24, 2008 - 3:59 p.m.

(Exhibit 1 marked)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: Okay. I think we're going to get started. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Butch Hollowell, and I'm the State Insurance Consumer Advocate. And I want to welcome you here to the fourth and final insurance affordability hearing that we're having around the state. The hearings have gone all across Michigan. started in Grand Rapids and then after that we were in Bay City, following Bay City was in Detroit and now we're in beautiful Marquette, at this incredibly beautiful facility. And I also wanted to start off by thanking Northern Michigan University, in particular President Les Wong and his office. They've been incredible. The AV department and Judy Maara, the conference and catering. So it's just been a really nice welcome that we've had. So we want to thank you all for being here. And I know I probably don't need to say this, but if everyone would get your cell phone, and if you would turn it to off or at least to silence so that we can have attention during the entire hearing. The hearing is scheduled from 4:00 to 6:00. It doesn't have to go that long, or maybe it could go a little longer, but we'll play that by ear. And so essentially the focus of the hearing is looking at the affordability of automobile insurance here in

this State. And there's two specific questions, you know, that we're going to, you know, be focusing on. And question number one is are rates here in Michigan affordable, and question number two is does the regulatory scheme that we have, is it adequate to oversee the rate-making structure. These are the two issues that we're going to be looking at with these hearings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, also you should have in your possession a poll, just an audience poll, where we want to take your temperature on what's going on and your -- your life and how you've been experiencing auto insurance. And we'll announce the results of that. And you should know that we have a court reporter here just over to my right, and so we'll have a transcript of these entire hearings. And that transcript from all four hearings will be downloaded to our website, which is Michigan.gov/lowerratesnow, so the entire transcript will be available to you, as well as any documents that have been submitted. If you have any letters or if there were reports or there are any studies or things like that that people have wanted to introduce, statements, what-have-you, the procedure is that they would give them to the hearings clerk, and that's Mary Miller. And we'll have them labeled and then it will be entered into the record by the court reporter. The way that we will proceed is we'll have just a very brief overview, and then we will hear from

individuals representing the industry and consumers, and then your turn, which is really why we're here. And we're just frankly very thankful that you've taken the time out from your day to be here.

Now, I'd like to introduce the folks who are sitting to my right and left. And I'm just thrilled that here to my left is our State Insurance Commissioner, Ken Ross. And he is the head of the Office of Financial and Insurance Regulation, so that includes not only the insurance industries, but also the banking industries. It is a big job, and so as the Commissioner, he oversees all of that. And there could not be a finer person representing the state's interests in connection with that. And so thank you for being here, Mr. Commissioner. Would you like to say anything?

MR. ROSS: I just thank you for the opportunity. Luckily we had good weather driving up here today, and I'm here to hear particularly any citizens who are willing to provide testimony on these issues, because we have a very exceptional system, I think, in Michigan to provide financial security and coverage for those driving automobiles. It's a system, however, that is an expensive system, and I have continuing concerns that it not become too expensive so that people can't take advantage of it.

Because if people can't afford a great system, it's not much

of a system. So I'm interested in hearing particularly citizens' input on that issue. Thank you.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. And then to my right is -- I'm just really thrilled that he can be here. Mark Gaffney, who is our colleague here, is President of the Michigan AFL/CIO. And I think, Mark, you were telling me 450,000 active members throughout the State of Michigan. He represents working men and women across the state. They work for economic justice in the workplace, as well as in society. I can't tell you how happy we are that you are here with us. Would you like to say anything, Mark?

MR. GAFFNEY: Thank you, Mr. Hollowell. I'm pleased to be here today to share the perspective of Michigan citizens on the important issue of auto insurance rates. While driving and owning a car in Michigan isn't necessarily a right, it is certainly a necessity. Folks in our Upper Peninsula know that as well as anyone. While it may not seem -- since 1989 we've seen auto insurance rates rise about 3-1/2 percent a year on the average, and while that may not seem like a lot in each and every year, may I remind you of two things. One, that's a total of 69 percent over 19 years, and workers, working families in Michigan have not necessarily seen their incomes rise 3-1/2 percent every year for the last 19 years. So it's important to union members and all Michigan working families that auto

insurance rates be reasonable, affordable, appropriate and fair. And, Mr. Hollowell, let me thank you for including the AFL-CIO in the hearing today.

MR. HOLLOWELL: We're delighted that you're here; we're just -- just delighted. Thank you very much. Okay. So I'm going to start out with a very brief overview. And there were some promises that were made that I wanted to just talk to you about, just to give you a perspective. I was a freshman in high school in September of 1973, and that was when no fault went into effect, so in -- so in 1973 no fault went into effect. And there were three famous promises that were made with respect to no fault. Promise number one is that it's a simple system. And by that, you know, they got rid of the tort system that preceded it, so you don't have to sue anybody to get your recovery; you go to your own insurance company in order to get your relief. So it's a simple system. It got rid of having to, you know, do a lawsuit.

And then, number two, it made you whole. And this was the idea from Governor Milliken. And the idea was, again, that if you are injured in the course of an automobile accident, we will make sure that the system will take care of you, so there are lifetime benefits that we have here in Michigan. And so we wanted to make sure that we would take care of people. And so this was one of the key components

of it.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Does anybody remember what the third famous no fault promise was?

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, key component.

MR. HOLLOWELL: What was it?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Key component.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Lower rates. That was the third famous promise; lower rates. That rates would go down. would rates go down? Rates would go down because more people -- now people are required to have insurance. tradeoff is that, one, you had to make sure that you wouldn't sue unless there's death or serious impairment of bodily function. So -- and then number two is you're now required to have no fault insurance. So it's a compulsory system. And this was the tradeoff. So for the three famous promises, you had to say, one I'm going to give up the right to sue except under certain circumstances, and now it is a compulsory system; you must have it. You can spend up to a year in jail if you don't have insurance in Michigan. So these were the tradeoffs. But something happened. Rates didn't go down; they actually went up. And as President Gaffney was saying, they went up -- they went up immediately after no fault went into effect, and we've seen a continual increase and, in recent years in particular, we've seen a spike. Again, since 1969, 69 percent. So rates didn't go

down; they went up. And so the Michigan Supreme Court 1 2 stepped in and said you cannot have a system which requires 3 insurance without some quarantee that rates are affordable 4 to the consumer. So you all remember Soapy Williams, G. Mennen Williams, who used to be governor, and then he was 5 Chief Justice of the Michigan Supreme Court. So he 6 declared -- the Michigan Supreme Court declared no fault was 7 unconstitutional in 1978. It was a famous case called 8 9 Shavers vs Attorney General. And his ruling was, we've got 10 to make sure that rates are affordable for people. And his 11 definition is that they had to be fair and equitable to the 12 consumer. Okay. So they declared no fault unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court said to the 13 14 Legislature, "All right. Now you've got to fix it. You 15 must come up with a definition of affordability to the 16 consumer." But there was another twist. The Legislature 17 came up with a definition from the insurance industry's 18 perspective. And instead of what's affordable to the 19 consumer, it was reasonable competition among insurance companies. And so what we have here is two different 20 21 definitions of affordability in Michigan. It's kind of an 22 odd situation. And they live side by side, and they're at 23 war with each other. And so what has happened is over the -- since really '78, we've been following the 24 25 Legislature's definition, and, as a result, I want you to

look at what their definition was. The Legislature wrote a 401 word definition of affordability. There is a loophole and a exception of every line, and I wanted you to see it. 401 words. If anybody can read it and understand it, they win the gold star. And this is what happened. And I think this is really -- this goes to the heart of our problem. We'll get to that in one second. Now, just to give you a perspective, the entire Gettysburg Address is only 272 This is to tell you how long it took for the words. Legislature to put their definition in place. So Lincoln saved the entire union in 272 words, and the insurance industry put together a definition that we're living under now, 401 words. And here is the result. We have some of the highest rates in the nation. The average state-wide rate in Michigan is about \$1000 for the average annual premium. We're right just below New Jersey, which is the highest in America, and that's at 1100. We pay the highest collision premium in the United States, \$436. We have the highest urban premium in the United States. Now, when I talk about 69 percent, President Gaffney talked about it and I talked about it, what that means is that we're going to pass New Jersey soon, so we're right on -- unfortunately on their heels and we're going to -- we will pass them soon, at a time when we can least afford it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I just wanted you to also look at the insurance

industry profits, what they've been in the past few years.

And nationally insurance industry profits have been setting all time U.S. records, except for in 2001. I think we all know what happened on September the 11th there. But, with that exception, even including Katrina, these records -- these profits have been at record levels. 2006 was a U.S. record, 2005 was a U.S. record, 2004, 2003, these were all records. This is truly the golden age of the industry.

Deregulation. Rates now can be raised in Michigan without the prior approval of the state. So essentially the companies can give themselves a raise without a prior hearing, without prior approval. The Commissioner does not have the authority to order refunds, even if they are required. And credit scoring, your credit history, how you pay your bills, your occupation, the job that you have and your level of education are all being used by insurers; since 1996 they've been using it. Now, recently the Court of Appeals had a good decision on that, but still the companies are using these factors until the Michigan Supreme Court decides to hear the case.

So why we're here today is to look at -- hear from you what can we do to make rates more affordable. So we're going to hear from different sides. We'd like to hear from you, and, you know, at a time again when we're looking at

unemployment figures and figures of deep economic distress, we need to do everything we can to help the pocketbooks of the ordinary consumer.

Now, with that, I am going to stop. We're going to hear from Scott Hummel, and Scott is the vice president of the Michigan Association of Insurance Agents. He's had a very distinguished career. From 2001 to 2006 he served in the State Legislature, in the House of Representatives, representing Clinton and Gratiot Counties. He was chair of the House Appropriations Committee. And, again, now he's vice president at the Michigan Association of Insurance Agents. And it is the largest association in Michigan for the independent insurance agent, and it represents approximately 1,100 agencies and 10,000 industry employees. And so, Scott, if you'd come on up. And we're delighted that you're here.

MR. HUMMEL: Thank you, Mr. Hollowell, and -- I should say Insurance Advocate Hollowell. And Commissioner Ross and Mr. Gaffney, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and the Michigan Association of Insurance Agents appreciates the opportunity for us to testify here at this public hearing.

You gave us a brief description of MAIA. If I could expand upon that just a little bit, it's a state-wide trade association of over 1,000 independent insurance agencies and

their 10,000 employees and agents. Our members are independently owned small businesses that offer a variety of insurance and financial services, and, generally speaking, represent more than one company. Although our members act as distributors of insurance products offered by a multitude of companies, independent agents will, when a loss occurs, stand with a client or insurance consumer and advocate on their behalf until the claim is settled. Mr. Hollowell, you've asked us to address two questions, and the first is are Michigan auto insurance rates affordable. This question should be addressed not solely related to actual premium costs for insurance consumers, but also to the level of benefits received. And you've mentioned that in Michigan we have some of the -- well, we have the most -- or I guess it was the Insurance Commissioner that mentioned that we have probably the most generous benefits in the country. In addition, the number of uninsureds, the number of competitors in the marketplace and other cost drivers should be considered in trying to answer that question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Under Michigan's auto no fault law, Michigan's drivers and passengers are provided some of the most comprehensive protections offered in the country in the event of automobile-related injuries received in an accident.

Unlimited personal injury protection, or PIP, provides medical care and covers health-related expenses until the

injured party recovers, or for their entire life, if they were tragically never to recover from their injuries. other state provides unlimited medical benefits in such instances; no other state. With the increasing cost of health care related expenses that have far outpaced the rate of inflation, it's a wonder that Michigan doesn't rank higher in state combined average premiums for the 50 states. 2002 statistics from the NAIC rank Michigan 13th among the states with an average premium of \$925, compared to the country average of \$831. Now, if you also take the cost of the MCCA related expenses, some were involved in the catastrophic accident, of about \$100 a year, that we are not out of line with the average cost for all states if you subtract that MCCA charge from the Michigan average cost and compare that with the average for all states. Again, balancing the benefits that we receive under no fault versus the cost of that insurance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The number of uninsured in the marketplace might also be an indicator of affordability. In Michigan, drivers must have automobile insurance, and certainly there are penalties assessed if we don't. You've alluded to that. One might interpret that if there's a large number of uninsured in the state or in any one area that are willing to risk exposure to both violation of state law and personal loss, that might be reflective of affordability concerns. Some estimates

show that the state level of the uninsured may be as high as 17 percent in Michigan, and that's not out of line with other states. However, there are some urban areas where the estates rise as high as 50 percent of those driving without insurance coverage. Now, that is a concern and that may be reflective of affordability issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A lack of competitors in the state or a particular region may also be an indicator of affordability. With 169 domestic insurers and over 1000 foreign or out of state insurance companies operating in Michigan, one can safely conclude that there probably is a competitive marketplace in Michigan, and that leads to competitive pricing for consumers. Anecdotally, many agents in our association have indicated that their workload has increased significantly over the last couple years as the economy has turned down, as people are out shopping more, trying to make their dollars go farther, and they're being lured from company to company through lower rates. But, in Michigan, if there is competition, and that does appear to be the rule, are there areas in the state where we see a lack of competition, because, again, that may be indicative of the high cost of doing business in those areas. And we have to ask the question as to what those underlying costs are that are keeping competition from happening.

We have to be honest in admitting that businesses and

insurance companies as well are in the business to make money and to make a profit. They will go where -- any business will go where the opportunity is, and if they don't go there, there's probably reasons why they don't, if they can't make a profit. So what are some of those cost factors? Fraudulent claims, auto theft, medical costs, uninsured motorists, auto repairs, all contribute to the cost of auto insurance. The increased cost of auto insurance has been directly related to the increase of some of the factors I just listed, with hospital services themselves outpacing the cost of insurance by over 100 percent. Again, in an unlimited medical state, like we have here, that's significant. In an 2005 epic MRA statewide poll of Michigan voters on insurance related issues, respondents indicated that the top three reasons consumers believed or they believed that insurance costs were rising faster than the rate of inflation were, one, the rising cost of health care; two, fraudulent claims by consumers; and, three, frivolous lawsuits. Even when they had the choice to choose also profits by insurance companies or executive pay as well. So insurance consumers get it, and we should, too.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In conclusion on this particular question,
affordability concerns are being linked to profits for the
insurance industry. I need to ask a fundamental question
regarding profits. What happens when an industry is not

profitable? Well, I think all we have to do is to consider the auto industry today, especially here in Michigan, and where they are. They've lost thousands of jobs even in Michigan in the last decade, precisely because it has not been profitable. Hostile business environments are great for states like Indiana or Wyoming, who have been actively at work in Michigan trying to lure not only workers but also companies out of Michigan, insurance companies and business in general.

The insurance industry is healthy in Michigan, protecting consumers' lives and investments. They provide thousands of jobs here in the state at the company level, at the agent level, for the health care industry, for auto repair shops. You get the idea.

The second question, has Michigan's deregulation of the insurance industry allowed for adequate oversight of auto insurance rates begs the question, who is doing the regulating. My -- my sense and my experience says, one, that the Insurance Commissioner or the Office of Insurance and Financial Regulation is one, but also the State

Legislature. I won't speak on behalf of OFIR. Commissioner Ross can do that; he does have many tools at his disposal, however. But I would like to take just a moment and speak on the -- as a former legislator and a representative of

MAIA. It's my opinion that the State Legislature does have

and always will have oversight of insurance related issues, and specifically the cost of auto insurance. The question is whether the legislature takes its opportunity for oversight. In this case, I think there's one main reason that it has not addressed this as a body. The legislature tends to be a reactive body, meaning that if an issue or a crisis appears, it will respond. And it will respond quickly if constituents are asking for action. Are people complaining about their auto insurance costs? To a small degree, yes; in certain areas, definitely. And I think that is reflective in what you see happening at the state legislature. It hasn't reached a critical mass as a statewide issue. There have not been any high profile legislative hearings to investigate or even consider whether or not auto insurance rates are affordable. Specific legislation has been introduced by individual legislators in an attempt to address some affordability issues, and indicate some concerns for specific areas of the state, most notably Detroit. But, for a majority of legislators, this does not appear to be a significant issue for their constituents. They're not hearing the same sort of concern that legislators in the Detroit area are. The affordability issue appears to be an area-specific problem, not a state crisis demanding significant changes to Michigan's auto no fault laws. And we can get into more discussion on the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

specific area if you'd like in the question and answer period.

I would like to conclude my testimony by offering a fairly simple way of addressing the question of affordability. It's not mine; in fact, we heard it at our first hearing. But if we take the average premium cost in Michigan, which is about \$1,000, it's actually a little bit less than that, and divide it by the average miles driven per year by an individual -- let's use 10,000 for simplicity sake. It's actually a little bit more than that -- the average cost per mile for auto insurance in Michigan is roughly 10 cents per mile. And if you take what it costs for catastrophic coverage out of that \$1,000, which is \$100, then the auto insurance consumer is protecting themselves in the event of a catastrophic accident for less than a penny a mile. And that coverage through the MCCA and that cost is the same for every driver in the state. It's the same. that is affordable. Mr. Hollowell, again, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have, or the others on the panel.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Hummel.

Mr. Commissioner, any questions?

MR. ROSS: No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

MR. HOLLOWELL: Mr. Gaffney?

1	MR. GAFFNEY: Mr. Hummel, have you heard
2	complaints about auto rates other than the Detroit area?
3	It's come to my attention that folks in Saginaw and Flint
4	are also seeing their costs out of line.

MR. HUMMEL: It would be mostly urban areas, if, in fact, that were the case. Most of what I've heard, both as a legislator and a -- now in my position with the Independent Agents has been the Detroit area. In fact, we have tried to work with those in the Detroit area. Myself and some of the insurance company representatives met with area pastors in the Detroit area, looking at the affordability issues down there. Because it's not just an issue in terms of the cost, but it's actually an economic issue for Detroit. I mean people are leaving the City because of those sort of costs associated there. So I think it's very important that the legislature address that at some point. How you get the whole legislature involved in that is a different issue, since it's not -- it doesn't seem to rise to the issue of a state-wide concern.

MR. HOLLOWELL: You've changed your testimony a little bit since the first time.

MR. HUMMEL: A little bit.

MR. HOLLOWELL: In fact, a lot.

MR. HUMMEL: Well, I didn't think it was that much.

1	MR. HOLLOWELL: A lot. I actually have the
2	transcript, so I can tell you. You've really changed it a
3	lot since you testified in Grand Rapids. In fact, you
4	didn't talk about area specific at all in your testimony in
5	Grand Rapids; is that true?
6	MR. HUMMEL: That's true; I did not.
7	MR. HOLLOWELL: So is this a new recognition on
8	your part?
9	MR. HUMMEL: No, I think we we recognized that
10	before. I think this is just an admission that if I was
11	going to address the regulation of the the legislature's
12	oversight of this issue, that was an example showing why it
13	hasn't risen to the legislature looking at this as a whole,
14	but, rather, specific legislators trying to push specific
15	legislation to address this issue.
16	MR. HOLLOWELL: Well, in fact, the interesting
17	thing is we've had state wide hearings, and so this is the
18	third of four, and that the first hearing was in Grand
19	Rapids and a second hearing was in Bay City and the third is
20	here in the Upper Peninsula.
21	MR. HUMMEL: That's why I specifically said
22	legislative hearings.
23	MR. HOLLOWELL: Well, these aren't legislative
24	hearings. These are hearings for the people.

MR. HUMMEL: Well, I was referring to legislators

1	in Lansing having hearings based upon this issue.
2	MR. HOLLOWELL: And I was referring to the people.
3	MR. HUMMEL: Okay.
4	MR. HOLLOWELL: And so you talked also about cost.
5	You said cost in the system and you talked about fraud. Are
6	there any is there any statistics that you can share with
7	us that you have on a statewide basis as it relates to
8	fraud?
9	MR. HUMMEL: I don't have them with me, Mr.
10	Hollowell, but I
11	MR. HOLLOWELL: Does anyone?
12	MR. HUMMEL: I would have to look into that. I
13	know it's an issue. I know the Insurance Commissioner and
14	the companies are working on
15	MR. HOLLOWELL: I've talked to them.
16	MR. HUMMEL: the anti-fraud bureau, are working
17	towards that end.
18	MR. HOLLOWELL: I've talked to the companies. No
19	one says they have Michigan specific statistics. Does that
20	surprise you?
21	MR. HUMMEL: No, I think that's a very difficult
22	issue to follow, to be honest with you.
23	MR. HOLLOWELL: But you raised it.
24	MR. HUMMEL: I did raise it.
25	MR. HOLLOWELL: But there's no statistics.

1	MR. HUMMEL: That doesn't mean it doesn't happen.
2	MR. HOLLOWELL: But there's no
3	MR. HUMMEL: In fact, I would I would go so
4	much as to say that my understanding of the process of
5	reporting fraud in certain areas lends excuse me.
6	Reporting auto theft in certain areas lends itself towards
7	fraud.
8	MR. HOLLOWELL: How much is auto theft of the
9	entire premium?
10	MR. HUMMEL: I believe it's approximately 2
11	percent.
12	MR. HOLLOWELL: Yes. Now, you also talked about
13	theft, repair and other costs.
14	MR. HUMMEL: Uh-huh (affirmative).
15	MR. HOLLOWELL: You didn't talk about profits as a
16	part of the costs. Was that an omission on your part or
17	MR. HUMMEL: No, I did talk about I didn't I
18	talked in terms of other costs.
19	MR. HOLLOWELL: I said insurance industry profit
20	as a part of the cost.
21	MR. HUMMEL: Right.
22	MR. HOLLOWELL: But you didn't talk about that.
23	MR. HUMMEL: I did talk about profits, but I
24	talked about it in terms of relating to the need for
25	companies to be profitable, and comparing that with the auto

1 industry that's not profitable. MR. HOLLOWELL: Is it fair for us to look at 2 3 industry profits as part of the cost? 4 MR. HUMMEL: I think it probably is -- let me put it this way. I think that --5 MR. HOLLOWELL: I mean you're looking at all kinds 6 of costs. 7 MR. HUMMEL: Well, I know. 8 9 MR. HOLLOWELL: But the one cost that you leave 10 out was the insurance industry's record profits. 11 MR. HUMMEL: And that, I believe, was a national 12 profit. 13 MR. HOLLOWELL: It is. 14 MR. HUMMEL: And talking about all lines of 15 insurance, not necessarily automobile lines. They're not Michigan specific. I'd be interested in seeing the profits 16 for Michigan companies related to auto insurance, since 17 18 that's what we're basing this on. 19 MR. HOLLOWELL: We do have some, in the Angoff 20 study. And it indicates that they're very profitable here 21 in Michigan. I mean claims are down; right? You're an 22 agent. Claims are down.

MR. HUMMEL: I know the statistics lend itself

towards there being less -- related to the auto -- or auto

insurance, less incidences of claims and less severity.

23

24

25

1	However, when you look at the sophistication that goes into
2	an automobile today versus even ten years ago in terms of
3	air bags, self-restraint system, antilock brakes, those are
4	significant cost drivers when someone is involved in an
5	automobile accident.
6	MR. HOLLOWELL: And, in fact, there were 9,000
7	fewer accidents in the State of Michigan between 1996 and
8	2006; isn't that right?
9	MR. HUMMEL: You have those statistics, sir.
10	MR. HOLLOWELL: Does that sound right?
11	MR. HUMMEL: I don't have those in front of me.
12	MR. HOLLOWELL: 54 percent decrease. What I'm
13	saying is yes?
14	MR. HUMMEL: You have the statistics in front of
15	you;
16	MR. HOLLOWELL: I do.
17	MR. HUMMEL: I do not.
18	MR. HOLLOWELL: Those statistics are showing that
19	Michigan drivers are using their seatbelts now like they
20	weren't ever before, the graduated driver's license law
21	seems to be working. Dramatic reductions in the number of
22	crashes, but we see rates continue to go up.
23	MR. HUMMEL: And I think that's reflective, again
24	of the we'll say the costs associated with what goes into
25	insurance. If you look at Michigan's no fault auto

1	insurance over the last decade and compare that with motor
2	vehicle insurance in general for the country, it's 32 versus
3	31 percent. Medical care items have gone up 45 percent,
4	physician services 32 percent, hospital services 75 percent,
5	motor vehicle body work 30 percent. They're all in line.
6	MR. HOLLOWELL: And profit is up very
7	significantly. 63.7 billion, the highest in U.S. history.
8	MR. HUMMEL: What has been the percentage since
9	1999?
10	MR. HOLLOWELL: Since '89 it's been a 69 percent
11	increase.
12	MR. HUMMEL: But since '99, to compare it with
13	these figures.
14	MR. HOLLOWELL: They continue to go up.
15	MR. HUMMEL: Not every year it doesn't.
16	MR. HOLLOWELL: It's about an average of 3-1/2
17	percent a year. You said another thing about the economic
18	climate. Now, Michigan has now the highest rate of
19	unemployment in the nation. Should we consider an
20	individual's ability to pay a premium when we look at the
21	affordability of insurance?
22	MR. HUMMEL: Could you clarify that? You're
23	asking me
24	MR. HOLLOWELL: Yeah. I mean if I make \$35,000 a
25	year and if I've got a premium that's, I don't know, two

Τ	grand a year or, you know, \$1,000 a year, should we look at
2	the ability that I have in terms of my income and my other
3	bills in looking at what's affordable and what's not. I
4	mean we do that in other industries. Like if we say, you
5	know, can you afford a mortgage that's \$600,000 versus a
6	mortgage that's 50,000.
7	MR. HUMMEL So you're just asking should we look
8	at the definition of affordability in relationship to
9	ability to pay; is that what you're asking me?
10	MR. HOLLOWELL: Is it a factor? Should it be a
11	factor, one's ability to pay?
12	MR. HUMMEL: I don't think so.
13	MR. HOLLOWELL: At all?
14	MR. HUMMEL: No.
15	MR. HOLLOWELL: Okay. And then you also indicated
16	that there was an EPIC poll.
17	MR. HUMMEL: Uh-huh (affirmative).
18	MR. HOLLOWELL: How many participated in that
19	poll?
20	MR. HUMMEL: I'd have to get that information for
21	you. That's a poll that actually MAIA did in 2005. Well,
22	hang on just a second. I may have it with me here. If you
23	want to ask me another question while I look.
24	MR. HOLLOWELL: I'll wait.
25	(Mr. Hummel reviews documents)

1	MR. HUMMEL: I don't have the numbers, sir, but I
2	think I can find that out.
3	MR. HOLLOWELL: I actually do have the numbers.
4	MR. HUMMEL: Oh, okay. Great.
5	MR. HOLLOWELL: There are 250 people that were
6	surveyed in that. And you're a former elected member of the
7	legislature. Is that a valid statistical group from which
8	to derive a meaningful number?
9	MR. HUMMEL: I think the probably the error
10	rate is higher than most some you might see.
11	MR. HOLLOWELL: Would you rely on it if you were
12	running for office?
13	MR. HUMMEL: If that's all I had, yeah.
14	MR. HOLLOWELL: You would?
15	MR. HUMMEL: Uh-huh (affirmative).
16	MR. HOLLOWELL: Oh, okay. And who paid for it?
17	MR. HUMMEL: I believe we paid for that.
18	MR. HOLLOWELL: I don't have any more questions.
19	Thank you.
20	MR. HUMMEL: Thank you.
21	MR. HOLLOWELL: And now we will hear from Fran
22	Wallace. Fran Wallace was, until June of this year, the
23	Chief Deputy Commissioner of the Office of Financial and
24	Insurance Regulation. And before that she was Director of
25	the Health Plans Division. What she will do is to read into

1	the record testimony from the expert that testified on
2	behalf of consumers, and his name is Birney Birnbaum. Mr.
3	Birnbaum is the Executive Director of the Center for
4	Economic Justice in Austin, Texas, who had a long history of
5	working on behalf of consumers on insurance issues. He has
6	been the chief economist of the Texas Department of
7	Insurance, and he also has special knowledge of insurance
8	data, collection and public access to the data necessary for
9	consumers to hold insurers accountable for market practices.
10	He has a Master's Degree from the Massachusetts Institute of
11	Technology in both management and urban studies and
12	planning. He's one of a handful of consumer advocates
13	funded by the National Association of Insurance
14	Commissioners, and he is on the NAIC's National
15	Association of Insurance Commissioners Board of Trustees.
16	So, thank you, Fran Wallace, for agreeing to read the
17	testimony into the record for Mr. Birnbaum.
18	MS. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Hollowell. Mr.
19	Birnbaum begins.
20	"I'd like to summarize my main conclusions. First is

"I'd like to summarize my main conclusions. First is that the cost of auto insurance in Michigan places a significant financial burden and is unaffordable for a large and growing portion of Michigan consumers. The problem is not because of no-fault insurance, and it will not be solved by cutting no-fault coverage.

25

Insurers should not be responsible for solving broader economic problems in society, but the sale of auto insurance should not penalize those experiencing economic hardships. Yet, because of the way insurers rate insurance policies, insurers are, in fact, penalizing middle class Michiganians with unfair and excessive auto premiums. The current system of lax regulatory oversight, deregulation, does not provide meaningful or sufficient consumer protection. In the same way that deregulation led to abusive mortgage ending and a financial crisis, the deregulation of auto insurance has led to market failures and a lack of affordability for a large number of consumers. The answer to the problems of auto insurance affordability is not to eliminate essential coverage, which is exactly what the so-called limited no fault option does; rather, the solution to the affordability problems is to enact meaningful regulatory oversight over policy forms, rates and risk classifications, and to prohibit unfair rating factors based on economic status, and to promote rating factors which empower the consumer, such as pay by the mile auto insurance, which will spur true competition in auto insurance markets. Okay. A little bit of an overview. As the consumer advocate talked about, Michigan's average auto premium

is relatively high. Now the latest numbers from the NAIC say that the average premium is \$925, which is 13th highest compared to the U.S. average of \$817. So Michigan overall is a lot higher than the national average, and, since 2001, the increase has been over 26 percent compared to only 12 percent nationally, so the numbers are high and getting higher. Now, in terms of the burden, while the average expenditure is 13th highest, in 2004-05 government figures say that Michigan had the 27th highest median household incomes, so not the 13th highest, but the 27th highest. So while Michigan is in the middle in terms of median household income, it's closer to the top in terms of auto expenditures.

Now, another way that the burden or the unaffordability of auto insurance on average can be shown is that Michigan has a higher uninsured motorist rate than the country on average. The Insurance Research Council in 2004 showed the U.S. at 14 percent and Michigan at 17 percent. Now averages really don't tell the whole story. The fact that a few consumers pay the average doesn't tell us what the large number of consumers are paying, and large numbers of consumers are paying clearly more than the average, and, in many cases, much more than the average. Now, we used to think that high

25

auto insurance premiums were for bad drivers, people who have had a lot of accidents or driving violations. But that's really not the case anymore. Insurers are using a host of rating factors that penalize consumers for economic conditions. Before I get into those particular factors, let's look at some of the economic conditions. In 2007, Michigan ranked third highest in foreclosure rates, almost 2 percent of homes just in 2007 made foreclosures. Since 2005, 300,000 foreclosures have been made and 200,000 filings just since 2007. The most recent unemployment statistics put Michigan at number two, at 8.7 percent. This year alone there have been 80,000 net jobs lost. In terms of homeowner's equity, 46.6 percent of mortgages have negative or near negative equity, which means there's more owed on the mortgage than the home is worth, almost half of the homes in Michigan. That 46.6 is twice the national average. It's second highest in the nation. Michiganians have the second lowest net homeowner's equity of only 15 percent, which, of course, means that there's very little room for catastrophic issues. Now, given these economic indicators, even fairly priced auto insurance would be a challenge for middle class Michigan consumers. because of lax or no regulatory oversight of how

25

insurers use auto rating factors, insurers are penalizing middle class consumers because of economic conditions outside of the consumer's control, using things like credit score. Now, what are some of the things that go into your credit score. Well, certainly some of it is whether you pay your bills on time, but a lot of what goes into your score is the ratio of your debt to your limit. Well, as people become unemployed and they use their credit cards more and they rely more on debt, those go up. Now, foreclosures, that means more public notice, so credit scores and credit histories are deteriorating, which means that insurers are getting higher premiums even without changing rates. Insurances also use employment and education factors. They use other factors that are tied to economic status, such as prior bodily injury limits and prior insurance carriers and household composition, the number of drivers versus vehicles. So they punish consumers who try to economize by getting rid of a vehicle, and have two drivers with one car. What's missing are rating factors rated towards driving record and miles driven. Consumers who are driving many fewer miles because they've lost their job or because of high gas prices should see immediate reductions in insurance premiums, but with the current rating system, if the

consumer sees any reduction at all, it will be in the future.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, as I said before, insurance companies shouldn't be in the position of solving economic problems in society, but they shouldn't be penalizing consumers for those economic problems. And that's what the situation is now. And what we have is a failure of the current regulatory system, which is a failure of deregulation. There are three types -- there are three aspects of deregulation. One is policy forms, which is the product itself; overall rates; and the third is risk factors or rating factors. In terms of forms, there's virtually no regulation at all. The forms don't even have to be filed. These are complex legal documents. The idea that consumers don't need somebody skilled like a regulator to look at those documents and determine that they are fair is absurd. The other thing about it is that the amount of coverage and the nature of the coverage is intimately tied to what's a fair rate. So if you have no oversight over the product, then how can you determine whether the rates are fair. In terms of overall rates themselves, the statutes say that the Commissioner cannot do anything unless he or she first finds that there's no competition or there's a lack of competition. Now, let

25

me touch on that. That's truly not only absurd, but unworkable. It presumes that in a, quote, 'competitive market,' no insurer could possibly charge an excessive rate. Well, let me give you some data. In 2007 the loss ratios for auto physical damage -- and when I say the loss ratio, that is the amount of dollars paid out in claims as a percentage of the premium. And 70 percent is a minimum for what the claim payout should 70 percent means that you're paying out in claims, but you're making enough between investment income and underwriting profit that you make a reasonable rate of return. In 2007 Allstate paid out 43.6 percent, Auto Club 54.4 percent and State Farm 72.4 percent. Now, how can you have a range of 30 percentage points, and all those rates are reasonable? Was that an anomaly? In 2006, Allstate only paid out 41.6 percent, Auto Club was at 52.8 percent and State Farm at 65.9 percent. It should be obvious that somebody should be looking at Allstate's rates, and you don't -- you shouldn't need to make this grand determination that there is, quote, 'no competition in the marketplace.' Now, at the last hearing I talked about the unfair rating factors. And, again, this is a problem. theory the statute says that you can only use a certain number of rating factors for auto insurance, and yet

1 there seems to be this loophole that says you can use 2 anything else as long as it's, quote, 'a discount,' 3 except insurers have never demonstrated that these 4 rating factors are, in fact, discounts that result in 5 lower expected claim costs. So when you put all three of those together, you have 6 basically a regulatory system where there's no 7 oversight. Basically it says we have complete faith in 8 9 the market, and yet there are clear market failures. 10 And what we have seen, you know, in the mortgage market, it makes clear, and even Alan Greenspan has 11 12 admitted, is that you can't really rely simply on market forces to protect consumers." 13 Thank you, Mr. Hollowell. 14 15 MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, any questions? 16 17 MR. ROSS: He's not here to answer. She's just 18 reading his testimony. 19 MR. HOLLOWELL: Okay. 20 MR. GAFFNEY: Maybe you could explain, Fran, not 21 based on the testimony, but based on your work over the 22 years, how it could work to reduce insurance rates if 23 someone lost their job and drove less. Is there a way that 24 we could actually do that? Because, to me, the point that

the economist was making seems to make sense; right? At the

25

I lose my job, I spend a period of months -- in Michigan it could end up being a long period of months -- and I'm driving a heck of a lot less, in theory reducing my risk to myself and to the insurance company. Would -- could you

beginning of the year, I'm driving a lot to and from work.

6 conceive of some sort of reporting mechanism or something?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. WALLACE: I think that if rates were based -if more of the premium that you pay was based on your driving behavior and how far you drive, how much you drive, then that factor would have more weight in whether your premium went up or down. For example, in the State of California, they determined that there should be a rating system that placed more emphasis on miles driven than upon other factors. Their legislature and their voters simply said we don't -- we don't want to just go with some insurance carrier's statistical model or what actuaries think is right. We think it's good public policy to, say, when you base your rates, give more weight to these factors than to other factors. And so that would be one way it would -- as if rates placed more emphasis on miles driven, since your rate tends to change every six months, because most of us have six months' policies, then it seems to me it would stream in a little faster if more of your rate reflected your driving -- the number of miles that you drive. Is that responsive to your question?

1 MR. GAFFNEY: Uh-huh (affirmative). Thank you.

2 MR. HOLLOWELL: I did have one issue. You heard Mr. Hummel's testimony. As you read Mr. Birnbaum's 3 testimony into the record, I made a little checklist. And 4 he talked about Michigan -- and the checklist was under, 5 really, on this overall heading of what he calls the middle 6 class burden. And he ticks off a number of things that you 7 went through as you read it into the record. He talks about 8 9 Michigan's foreclosures, Michigan's unemployment rate, 10 Michigan's negative homeowner's equity, Michigan's insurance companies' use of credit scoring, education and employment. 11 12 Michigan's failure of the deregulation system, Michigan's unreasonable rates and Michigan's regulatory system with no 13 14 oversight. Mr. Hummel said that from their perspective, or 15 from his perspective, that this was an area specific issue. 16 Did Mr. Birnbaum's testimony ever talk about being area specific or was it all state-wide? 17 18

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Hollowell, it appears to be all state-wide and it appears to be tied to economic class.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. Thanks very much. All right. Now, at this part of the hearing, you all saw in the back of the room that there are these testimony cards that we're going to fill out. And so we're going to call them in order. And so if you would come forward, there is a microphone over here at the front. If you'd come up as I

1	call your name, and then make sure so that the court
2	reporter can get it, if you would spell you know, say
3	your name and then spell it and then, you know, we'll give
4	you a reasonable amount of time. We've been using the three
5	minute rule of thumb, but we'll we'll be flexible on
6	that. So the first name that I have is Bill Hetrick. Is
7	Mr. Hetrick
8	AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's not here.
9	MR. HOLLOWELL: He's not. Okay. All right.
10	We'll call him see if he comes back. David Smith.
11	MR. SMITH: Good afternoon.
12	MR. HOLLOWELL: Good afternoon. If you'd just
13	give us your full name and spell it, please.
14	MR. SMITH: It's David Robert D-a-v-I-d
15	R-o-b-e-r-t Smith. S-m-I-t-h.
16	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you for being here.
17	MR. SMITH: My pleasure. I come wearing several
18	different hats, not only as a Michigan resident and consumer
19	of auto no fault insurance, but also a case manager for over
20	fifteen years with Marquette General's Traumatic Brain
21	Injury program. And I'm the U.P. representative for the
22	Brain Injury Association of Michigan.
23	MR. HOLLOWELL: With Marquette General, you said?
24	MR. SMITH: Marquette General. And I'm also with
25	the Brain Injury Association of Michigan. So I kind of

delve myself into advocacy for clients, providing services that are medically necessary for them. As a provider, definitely I agree with PIP benefits, not from just lining my pocketbook and making an income. I just see the long term effects of head injury, and how allowing the consumer to decide that amount or having someone else decide that amount could have some very negative benefits or effects on someone's future of medical care. Another aspect of my role, I'm -- I work with the Department of Community Health on developing traumatic brain injury services, with specific attention in the Medicaid realm, which, in reading Governor Granholm's article in The Mining Journal yesterday talking about cutbacks, makes me very saddened that there may be some cutbacks in the future with our new proposal that has been approved, but we just need to find some funding. My concern if there would be a change in auto type services or PIP benefits in Michigan is that consumers would be more reliant on state services for those. And services are less and less. I'm very saddened to say that auto no fault clientele receive and are given different options than someone who is not an auto no fault type individual. So it's very sad to see that individual not get the same opportunities to maximize their recovery process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: What do you mean by that, there's a different level of care?

1 MR. SMITH: Opportunities for a client with 2 Medicaid versus a client with auto no fault can vary.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: So let's say we have somebody that's got auto no fault and somebody who has got Medicaid, what's the difference that you see?

MR. SMITH: I see, as a coordinator of services, that, say, you use examples of a car accident versus someone falling off of a ladder, maybe the same type of injury, same kind of deficits, the auto no fault is going to help that person with not only the medical expenses, but also the lost wages because they can't work. The additional assistance they're going to need at home or if they need to be hospitalized in a residential facility, or need specific care within the home, under Medicaid those services are going to be vastly different. I'm not going to have someone through Medicaid to pay lost wages, I'm not going to have someone to help that family provide care in the home. Yes, I do see that the system is not perfect between the two, but it is vastly different. And when I see someone that's involved in an automobile accident, I know at least that they're going to be taken care of. Not necessarily that I'm going to be the one providing the care for them, but they're going to at least be taken care of to help them through the recovery process to help them with their goals, and hopefully become a member of society again that can be

productive and can be as independent as possible.

MR. HOLLOWELL: If I could ask you another question, if someone has a traumatic brain injury, in terms of the cost of medical care and that, how fast do those kinds of costs build up? Let's say that you come into Marquette General and you're in the emergency room, you've had a terrible car accident and you're in the ICU for a week or whatever the amount of time is, three or four days, what kinds of costs are we talking about?

MR. SMITH: To be terribly honest with you, I wouldn't know the exact dollar figure. I can only estimate based on the numbers I'm familiar with when it comes to outpatient therapy services. And just from an outpatient, to give you an example, if I have a client that needs multidisciplinary therapy, and in my mind that's occupational, physical, speech, maybe neuropsychological services, every time they come through the door it's about \$1,000. So if they're there two or three times per week, we're talking 2-to \$3,000 a week, plus additional expenses beyond that when it comes to physician charges, to other medical expenses, pharmaceuticals, home care. You know, you can just keep going from there.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Do you ever see people go bankrupt as a result of health care costs, or know about that?

MR. SMITH: I see patients make choices of not

following through with medical care because of the potential expenses, yes. I see that a lot.

MR. ROSS: I'd just be interested, since the focus is on cost, are you aware, given your perspective and your interaction with the system, of areas in which cost savings could be realized while still maintaining a sufficiently

robust system of cost recovery?

MR. HOLLOWELL: Mr. Commissioner, any questions?

MR. SMITH: From my experience I think -- you know, I'm not touting, you know, my horn, but I think case management, medical case management can be a big cost savings, where they can actually follow that client through the system and making sure that that client is getting to where they should be and trying to cut down the expense, increase the communication.

MR. ROSS: Do you find, because I think case management services appear to be -- you find differences between companies and differences between folks who are in the system, whether or not they're able to utilize case management, do you find a difference between companies on their ability to use -- between patients, their ability to use case managers effectively, or across the board are you able to use a case manager on an approach for your auto no fault clients in order to kind of centralize and coordinate care for a person, to kind of wrap that around them so

1	they're getting an appropriate amount, but not redundant
2	care?
3	MR. SMITH: It's not real consistent, except
4	certain companies, and I think it determines there may be
5	a formulary out there that's utilized based on the
6	catastrophic factors. But I always promote and I know my
7	therapy team and physicians promote case management to help
8	with that communication, because that's just key when it
9	comes to the rehab perspective, in my experience.
10	MR. ROSS: And do you find it to be the case that
1	from the other side of the equation the patients who are
12	utilizing the case management find it beneficial to have
13	someone, or is there sometimes a resistance to use a case
_4	manager effectively to kind of negotiate the system? What's
15	your experience in that regard?
16	MR. SMITH: A majority it's helpful. On occasion
17	it's and if you get into some of the lawsuit issues, that
18	makes it sometimes more of a barrier than necessarily

20 MR. ROSS: And do you -- if I could just ask one 21 more?

MR. HOLLOWELL: Sure.

19

22

23

24

25

assisting.

MR. ROSS: Do you think that the climate in this area geographically positions a case manager any different than the rest of the state, or would there be a uniformity

among your counterparts in other areas of the state, based on your understanding, your experience and maybe networking or talking with your counterparts across the state?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SMITH: I think there's a consistency, but, also, living in the Upper Peninsula, we have a lot larger geographic area between providers, and I think it makes it even more important to have a case manager bridge that gap, versus in a more metropolitan type area. You may have lots of case managers that are closely located to the client and to the provider. I think it's all very helpful, but I think when you get into the geographic area that we have here, that can definitely really bridge a gap if you have a patient living in the Copper Country and their physician is in Marquette, what's to make sure that everything gets followed through with. You know, that patient may not see that physician for another six to eight weeks, and maybe if there's weather or there's a cancellation or whatever the reasoning may be, that sometimes is the link between the client and the provider.

MR. ROSS: Thank you.

MR. HOLLOWELL: That's good. President Gaffney?

MR. GAFFNEY: Thank you for very interesting testimony. One -- one question, as a practitioner in the field, would you be supportive or not supportive of a reduction in those medical benefits, or a choice to reduce

your own medical benefits in order to save the costs or 1 2 reduce the costs of auto insurance? 3 MR. SMITH: My personal? 4 MR. GAFFNEY: Yeah. 5 MR. SMITH: I'd say no. MR. GAFFNEY: Thank you. 6 MR. SMITH: Just recently I was able to cut my 7 rates extensively by joining with my homeowner policy. I 8 9 saved like \$400, so I was extremely pleased to see that. But I would -- you know, I guess the reason that I buy 10 insurance is for protection, and it's something to help in 11 12 that regards if I need it, you know, to pay for my medical, pay for repairs or whatever, as well as the fact it's the 13 14 law. You know, I guess I look at it from those three simple 15 means, that I don't think that I right now would be a good choice to allow me or -- personally to make a decision of, 16 17 you know, cutting my insurance rates if it would affect the 18 amount of coverage that I would have for auto PIP benefits, 19 should I be injured in a car accident. I guess it's a --20 it's where I work; I've seen too much. 21 MR. GAFFNEY: Thank you. 22 MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. And just so that we 23 have it for the record, we're using the acronym PIP.

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. HOLLOWELL: What do you mean by PIP?

24

1	MR. SMITH: Personal injury protection.
2	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. We really appreciate
3	your testimony. Thank you so much.
4	MR. SMITH: Thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate
5	it. Is that is?
6	MR. HOLLOWELL: That's all right. Bill
7	Hetrick. Has Bill Hetrick come back? Not yet. Okay. All
8	right. Now Cheryl I think it's called
9	MS. SHERONY: Sherony (pronouncing).
10	MR. HOLLOWELL: Sherony. Thank you. Please come
11	forward.
12	MS. SHERONY: I don't have a written speech.
13	Initially I was in a car accident with my son back in 1986.
14	MR. HOLLOWELL: I'm sorry. If I could just stop
15	you for one sec. If you could state your name and then
16	spell it for the court reporter.
17	MS. SHERONY: Okay. It's Cheryl with a C.
18	Sherony is S like in Sam h-e-r-o-n-y.
19	MR. HOLLOWELL: I'm sorry to interrupt you. Thank
20	you.
21	MS. SHERONY: S-h-e-r-o-n-y.
22	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you.
23	MS. SHERONY: We need no fault insurance in
24	Michigan. There's no doubt about it. My son has gone

through life with an injury since 3-1/2 years old. The

insurance company kicked in initially and did provide him with therapies, et cetera, because he did have a brain injury and he did have to have brain surgery, which was quite extensive. And without that, even the initial payment would have -- we would have been bankrupt. The insurance company did not tell us of our rights under Michigan. did not know that I was also supposed to be getting help from the insurance company. They didn't provide me with anything. The lawyers didn't tell me my rights, the insurance company didn't tell me what was covered. And my initial hospitalization was covered by my personal health insurance, and later I developed a marked profound depression from the accident. I was in the hospital for four months; we did not pay for that. My personal insurance paid for what they could, and we had a hearing at the state level and they allowed us to keep our house, otherwise we would have -- wouldn't have had a house. And after 5th grade -- we had then been having tutors through the insurance company for Michael for school. And they -- we could not find tutors for him at the price the insurance company wanted to pay, and so supposedly -- we didn't know this. I didn't know Michael was supposed to get benefits for life; nobody told us. He went through school with both his dad and myself tutoring him. I would tutor him in the mornings before school, and his dad would tutor him at night

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

after supper, and also in the morning sometimes he would get up at 5:00 o'clock and study in the morning. And we did not know we should have had those paid for by the insurance company. His therapy stopped around 5th grade, also. The educational system did pick up on him speech therapy, but they did not know how to effectively provide therapy for a brain injured person at that time. It was later, after he was going through -- tried college, he was supposed to have a note taker through the university disability program, and they would wait until school started, and six, seven weeks down the line they still wouldn't have a note taker for him or provide him with the services that he needed. At that point the university told him that he wasn't a candidate to go to school. And he would study very hard, he was very smart, but it took him longer to learn than the normal person. And so he did have B's and A's in the classes that he did take, but he dropped out because he couldn't keep up with it. Medical -- as far as medical was concerned related to the accident, we were paying from 5th grade through 12th grade, because nobody bothered to tell us what our rights were in Michigan. And also for my illnesses and treatments, they didn't pay for me at all, they didn't let me know that I was also covered under my own insurance. And the lawyer that we went to said "Oh, we'll take Michael's case and you'd better get your own lawyer, because you're going to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sued." They just didn't let me know my rights at all. It was just awful. But once we did find out that Michael was still eliqible for medical treatment -- I found this out through a friend -- I called the insurance agency and they said "Oh, well, we closed that case a long time ago." I said "You what?" "We closed it a long time ago." I said "Why?" He still needed help with his ADLs, he could not shower by himself to get himself clean. His dad didn't want to help him. That left me. Do you know how humiliating it was for a teenager to have his mother help him with a shower? It was all the little things that he needed that weren't provided that we did, and we didn't even know we were eligible for payment from the insurance company. We provided it. We could not find a tutor for him because the insurance company only wanted to pay \$5 an hour. And so it was excruciating on my husband to have to provide that therapy himself to Michael while still teaching full-time at the university. As for me, I lost jobs. And nobody bothered to tell me there was a wage benefit in the insurance company for me. And so I think another factor is a lot of people don't even know their rights in Michigan, and that has to be gotten out. We can't -- you know, without no fault auto insurance, Michael would not be able to take care of himself as much as he does today. He learned how to have a conversation, he learned how to talk

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on the phone, and he didn't learn any of that with the regular therapies provided when he was little. They would bake cookies with him and call that therapy. I don't know what therapy was supposed to be, but I was not happy with what was going on. And people need to know what their rights are in Michigan. You need to have these handouts like this (indicating) provided for people throughout the state. We don't know our rights. And if nobody is willing to cooperate and let us know what our rights are and what we can collect from no fault auto insurance, you might as well not have it.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Well, first of all, let me thank you for your courage in standing up here and telling us this story and the story of Michael. Let me ask you a question, if I might. You said some things that really struck home for me, that the insurance company didn't tell you your rights, that you were only allowed to keep your house after a hearing, that you didn't --

MS. SHERONY: And that was a hearing because I was in a mental institution and my insurance had run out. And I had a huge bill.

MR. HOLLOWELL: And that you didn't know that you were supposed to get your benefits for life. No one told you.

MS. SHERONY: No.

1	MR. HOLLOWELL: So if you had to rank the service
2	that you got from the insurance company
3	MS. SHERONY: And this is not only just from the
4	insurance company; it was also from the lawyers that I saw.
5	MR. HOLLOWELL: So if you had to rank your what
6	kind of service if you had A through F, what would you
7	give them?
8	MS. SHERONY: F.
9	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. Thanks for your
10	courage. Next, Nora Cardinal, please. Hi, how are you?
11	MS. CARDINAL: Hi. Well, I'm going to read
12	something to you because I'll probably get too emotional,
13	but it comes from my heart.
14	MR. HOLLOWELL: Well, take your time.
15	MS. CARDINAL: My name is Nora Cardinal. N-o-r-a
16	C-a-r-d-I-n-a-l. I don't know I'll look at my notes.
17	MR. HOLLOWELL: Take your time and just do it
18	however you like.
19	MS. CARDINAL: I listened to David speak and then
20	I listened to this lady speak, and after this lady spoke, if
21	I have anything to be grateful for, I am to stand up here
22	and say that my insurance my daughter's insurance company
23	did come to the hospital after the day of her accident and
24	sat with me and explained everything that she was entitled
25	to, what we could expect. They have been there for us the

last three-and-a-half years. They have been -- they have been my lifeline. My daughter had a car accident three-anda-half years ago. She was in ICU. When you said coma for a week, my daughter was in a coma for five-and-a-half weeks. The prognosis was a nursing home, and that -- you know, that would have been it. And in the U.P., that's pretty much --I mean there isn't -- the services in the U.P. are limited, and so I made the decision for my daughter to go to Grand Rapids. She has had -- a year after her accident she had a condition called heterotopic ossification in her leg. She was starting to walk a little. And I don't really want to get into the details, but let me -- okay. It has been a long three-and-a-half years, but my daughter recently moved into an apartment to further work toward independent living. She could never have had this chance at life again if it weren't for the coverage we had -- that we have. And we have met so many people, and we are so lucky. So many people in the same situation. Some of it is people don't know, some of it is people on Medicaid. They don't have the resources. And if I've learned nothing else in this threeand-a-half years, is brain injured people can heal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: Yes.

MS. CARDINAL: Brains heal. My daughter is advocating for other people. I'm just so proud of her, and I feel -- I feel blessed. Some days you want to give up,

you don't feel so blessed, but, you know what, it's been a long road. And she's been downstate and I live here in Marquette, so a good deal of my life has been -- but I'm seeing the payoffs, I'm seeing the results. This is going to be a productive person, and she's already, like I said, advocating for other people, just -- you know, not that she -- you know, she still can't walk. She's in a wheelchair. Whether she'll ever walk, we don't know. brain has gotten much better. She has short-term memory deficits. She will always have deficits. But what we learn is how to work around those deficits, what do you use to -if you forget your schedule for the day, you make a schedule for the day. You know, learning to live independently and without this catastrophic -- do you know what I mean? Without this help, she would never have been able to have a life. And I just -- I'm so grateful. I just -- I do want to address the credit report issue, too.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CARDINAL: My daughter had a \$356 bill from a hospital. She had been taken to the emergency room. It had to do with the car insurance, but for some reason it didn't get paid. I had to go in and check my credit reports this year for another matter, and found out that my credit score had gone from 816 to 691 because of that \$356 bill. And it was put on my credit report because I am her guardian. Need

1	I say any more about that?
2	MR. HOLLOWELL: You said it.
3	MS. CARDINAL: Thank you. Like I said, I am I
4	am blessed; I really am. Thank you. And I used to grumble
5	about paying the catastrophic, "Why are we paying this."
6	Believe me, I have had people in my life the last three-and-
7	a half years that not just my daughter, but I just you
8	live it, you see it. That's the only hope that's hope.
9	It's hope for life again, and they can do it. Brains heal.
10	MR. HOLLOWELL: Well, I want to thank you for you,
11	and I want to say that on behalf of the State, we are we
12	are blessed that you would have the courage to stand up in
13	front of that microphone and tell us what you just did.
14	Thank you.
15	MS. CARDINAL: All I'm going to say is it came
16	form my heart, and it's what it is.
17	MR. HOLLOWELL: I feel that. Thank you. Next,
18	Bruce Ruben, please.
19	DR. RUBEN: Good afternoon.
20	MR. HOLLOWELL: Good afternoon.
21	DR. RUBEN: Bruce Ruben. R-u-b-e-n.
22	MR. HOLLOWELL: Welcome.
23	DR. RUBEN: I stand as I'm a physician who
24	practices in Farmington Hills. I'm certified by the
25	American Board of Internal Medicine in internal medicine and

the subspecialty of infectious diseases. I'm also one of only four physicians certified in undersea and hyperbaric medicine, and I'm a provider of wound care to many catastrophically injured patients under the auto no fault personal injury protection. And I wanted to come to share my experience and my hope that this law will remain in force. But, more importantly, I've been taking care of this gentleman here (indicating), Brian Badgett. He has agreed to come with me. I've actually known this gentleman since I graduated fellowship in 1991, I think it was in January. And in August I became acquainted with Brian Badgett. He had had a motor vehicle accident, and had a tibial and a fibular fracture, and ultimately ended up requiring treatment pretty much for the rest of his life, after a number of years continued to pass with recurrent relapses in his lower extremity. And based on his original intraoperative report, the surgeons felt that based on his weight he would be a very poor candidate for an amputation. The experience that I had as a provider with his insurance company was one in which a case manager attempted to convince him and a number of physicians that amputation might be his best option. And the issue came to civil litigation, and ultimately Brian prevailed. And he is going to be 40 December the 3rd, but much of the care that has been provided to him has been by myself without

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reimbursement, in accordance with your law. Almost, I would say, probably five years piecemeal throughout this entire service has been provided to him, simply because of my ethical value system not to abandon my patient. And through my frustration, it's finally come to the point where I am -- I looked at the no fault law, and I really appreciate what you diagramed up on the board, because I was not -- I was actually in the same grade and the same year actually that you were when that law was passed.

And I have an interesting analysis about the issue as to the law and its intent, and one was to make -- the law should be simple, make patients whole and lower rates. And the other side of the law was it required Michigan citizens to own no fault coverage, and I believe you stated that the penalties for not holding no fault coverage was up to a year in jail.

MR. HOLLOWELL: That's correct.

DR. RUBEN: And I find that this is not -- I think the Michigan citizens have held up their end of the bargain and stood up to this statute and purchased no fault law, but I don't -- and through our executive branch and the criminal system and these penalties, scrutiny as well as education has created the atmosphere where this requirement is upheld. However, the other side that the citizens should have been expecting, that individuals are made whole and rates are

1	lower, I'd say has not been upheld by the insurance
2	industry. And so I have asked, other than in the civil
3	litigation arena, Brian here is learning disabled, he has no
4	guardian and he lives with his parents. And but not for
5	the medical treatment, I have constantly called his
6	representative on his behalf, and I said there's a law that
7	says you're entitled to reasonable medical care for your
8	accident. And I said who is who stands to protect us in
9	the event that a case of a claims adjuster or a large
10	insurance company with a deep pocket decides, without
11	medical background, that "Brian, I'm sorry, we don't think
12	that you need medical treatment." For this (indicating
13	photograph). Okay. He's happy to show you. "So we don't
14	think you need medical treatment for this (indicating).
15	We're sorry." Now, there isn't
16	MR. HOLLOWELL: If you would I'm sorry. I'm

MR. HOLLOWELL: If you would -- I'm sorry. I'm going to interrupt you. Describe for the transcript what it is that you are showing us. What is it that you're showing us a picture of?

DR. RUBEN: I'm showing a picture of Brian's lower extremity after the insurance company denied his benefit for my recommended treatment, which was intravenous antibiotics.

And so Brian then was -- did not have access to that, and his healed leg then had this recurrence in 1994.

MR. HOLLOWELL: I'm going to stop you again,

Doctor. So describe what that looks like. We can see that, but for those who are just going to read the transcript, what is it -- if you could describe in your own words what you are -- what we are seeing a picture of.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. RUBEN: What you're seeing is a very large ulcer over the anterior surface of his lower extremity. There's a second ulcer, which actually probes down to Brian's bone. These ulcers remain as a potential limbthreatening problem for him, as well as a life-threatening problem, because if Brian were to undergo amputation, it would require above the knee amputation, and the mortality for that is 50 percent in 5 years. And 10 percent of all those undergoing above the knee amputation actually expire within 30 days of their hospitalization. And, thankfully, I stood as his advocate that he, number one, does not want this type of surgery; and, number two, he's going to be 40. He still walks and he has a life and girlfriend and a normal social circle. And the challenges that are placed on the citizens, with the exception of Nora, who I think had a great experience -- I'd like to know the name of that company. I'd like to go purchase insurance from them. nice to know people do the right thing. It's -- it's been an extremely frustrating and challenging situation for me, and I'm hopeful that the legislature -- legislators will find some means of enforcing the law that they created, and

give individuals who don't have resources to hire attorneys a governmental resource that they can contact and say, you know, I understand there's fraud from our part, but we feel you're not living up to your obligations, and I think that scrutiny should be legally provided for the insurance industry.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the last comment I want to make is about case managers. A nurse case manager who comes to my office bringing a no fault insured beneficiary, if it's somebody who works for the insurance company, I can expect an adverse situation, because her financial interests are based on the claims adjuster and the insurance industry's interests. that case manager is independent, I could get two different opinions. The first case manager for this gentleman resigned because she had a father who had an above knee amputation, and she just resigned from the case. And she was independent. The second one was hired by the insurance company and was an insurance advocate. So I have a learning disabled, unprotected individual who cannot speak to these professionals on his own, and I was hoping that the law and my representatives, who I thought was -- they were there to protect me, would hopefully have some avenue, some strength to enforce these laws. And I think independent case management would be a great thing. I think it would improve the efficiency and the delivery of health care, because when

you have a number of doctors who are all on the same page,
everybody is talking and there's good communication, and the
case manager's incentive is to get the patient well, rather
than protect the financial interests of a company making
money, I think I always like to put myself in the shoes
of the individual. I think if I was a patient, I don't
think I would be reluctant to be with a case manager who was
independent, because they're my advocate, they're trying to
get me well. The case manager for an insurance company has
two things that they're trying to do, and they're always
balancing that.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Can I stop you for one second?

DR. RUBEN: Sure.

MR. HOLLOWELL: You responded to a comment that was made relative to earlier testimony about fraud, and then you've described -- you've shown us this picture of the ulcerated lower extremity and have explained to us at this hearing what the response of the insurance companies were. Would you describe their response to that, of denying the appropriate care, as fraudulent?

DR. RUBEN: No.

MR. HOLLOWELL: What would you describe it as?

DR. RUBEN: Oh, their response. I would consider their response as being something that looks at the law and feels like there's no reason to abide by it. I don't know

1	what that type of an attitude is. There's no sense of it
2	doesn't feel like the law itself has any real weight behind
3	it, so if I don't agree with you, then I have all kinds of
4	ways in which I can look toward not doing this, and
5	there's so I don't I wouldn't say fraud, because I'm
6	really not familiar with that.
7	MR. HOLLOWELL: So that's a legal term. But in
8	terms of their response, if you had to grade it on an A to F
9	scale, how would you grade it?
10	DR. RUBEN: F.
11	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. And thank you for your
12	commitment here. You know, it stands out to me, and I'm
13	looking at you and I'm looking at what you've done here in
14	terms of patient advocacy, and I'm very grateful that you've
15	done what you've done.
16	DR. RUBEN: Thank you.
17	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you for standing here.
18	DR. RUBEN: I'm grateful for the privilege of
19	doing it.
20	MR. HOLLOWELL: Awesome. Next we'll hear from
21	I think it's Bruce Sherony. Am I getting that right?
22	MR. SHERONY: Yes.
23	MR. HOLLOWELL: All right. Hi. Thank you for you
24	being here.

MR. SHERONY: Thank you. Good afternoon.

1 MR. HOLLOWELL: Good afternoon. Please state your 2 name, and if you'd spell it, please.

MR. SHERONY: I am Bruce -- B-r-u-c-e -- Sherony. S-h-e-r-o-n-y. And I'm the father of Michael Sherony. And in 1986 Michael was involved in a traumatic auto accident, resulting with a bad brain injury. That, you know, caused havoc in the family situation, but we were able to try to work through and wade through it. And as my wife had mentioned, we worked with Michael and tried to get him through school, give him the best that we could. And then our advocate attorney informed us that he could receive benefits based on the no fault law, and we were able to interact with the Eisenhower program, and then Michael progressed into that program. And no fault --

MR. HOLLOWELL: I'm sorry. If I can interrupt you, what is the Eisenhower program?

MR. SHERONY: It's a brain injury program in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you.

MR. SHERONY: So after high school, as we saw that Michael needed more and more attention and had difficulties, we were able to get him admitted into that program, which is paid for by the no fault insurance, so without the no fault insurance, we would be in a desperate financial situation. There was no way, given the amount of therapy and all of the

costs of a program like that, one could pay for it. And so basically, you know, insurance rates are never easy, but I'm happy to pay for them, being a recipient of the benefits for our son, and so I'm thankful for the no fault policy in the State of Michigan. And I do understand, you know, people who are out of work and are -- and are having problems with employability, have a -- would have a much more difficult time in doing that; however, it seems to me the benefits outweigh the costs, and hopefully our employment stability and our economy in Michigan, you know, will be reformulated and turned around. However, that is going to take time, because the issues are not easy issues. But in the bigger picture, the issues and the economy in the world are not easy issues, and those are part of the cause of the problems that many people in Michigan are going to have regarding employment. However, you know, I'm a strong supporter of the law as I see it at the present time, given we've been able to obtain the benefits that we have. And so the situations are very difficult. These problems are multidimensional, and they have to be unfolded over a long time stream. It takes a lot of patient capital to bring these people back; a lot of it, a lot of patient work by a lot of professionals. And that is very challenging to do. But in our own situation, we have seen some of the results of that, but it takes a long time. And that will conclude the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comments that I am able to present today.

MR. HOLLOWELL: I appreciate your comments. Let

me ask you a question. What if the economy doesn't come

back?

MR. SHERONY: Well, I don't think there's --

MR. HOLLOWELL: Well, I mean the question I would be asking is the supposition was that the people are struggling because of the economy. And to pay some of -- you know, the affordability of these rates. What happens to that -- those individuals if the economy doesn't come back?

MR. SHERONY: Well, I mean at that juncture, one would have to draw that conclusion. I can't anticipate that ever happening, but at that juncture, then, you know, if we were able -- to say the economy will never -- I can't see how that could be in the law of possibilities. That is so remote that I -- I don't even think that way. So I think -- you know, you have to work on building better economies, and it will take Michigan probably a long, long time. But there are too many wonderful, strong institutions and wonderful opportunities, plus, you know, in the next 30 or 40 years, our population is going to grow by 20 more million immigrants. So they're going to need things, they're going to need jobs. So if we're watching what we are doing and we can invent and we have smart people watching better opportunities, I -- I foresee the economy coming back, but

in our own state, we're going to hurt for a longer time, given the situation that we are in. And that may be an issue, but at that juncture you might have to make -- look at the situation again. But I don't see that occurring.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: And if it takes 30 or 40 years, what do we do in the interim?

MR. SHERONY: Well, I don't know what kind of -we have to -- what we're going to have to do in this state is build economic opportunities for people, because they're going to -- they're going to hurt in doing everything that they do. And so one of the bigger fundamental issues is what can we do economically to build a base and add to it and make it more viable in the market structure. And if they cannot afford no fault, then we would have to look at that, and I think people who are -- can't afford it will have to pay higher premiums, is my best guess. And so people who can't afford it, with some kind of proof that they can't, would be given relief or, you know, that might be possibility, rewarding people who are careful drivers and practice good driving principles. You know, that might be a possibility. Some of the ideas that we have heard about, you know, charging people less premiums who do drive less might be a possibility, but I think there are innovative ways to keep the provisions and get people into economically feasible situations so that they can pay their bills. Now,

as it gets harder and harder, you know, I don't know how -how bleak things can get. But I just think that the world
is too big, the economy is too potent not to reverse, is my
best guess. I mean you're asking me things that are --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: I know. And thank you so much. Any questions?

MR. ROSS: Yeah. I just wanted to make the point that in hearing your testimony, as well as Mrs. Sherony's testimony, my biggest disappointment in the testimony was hearing how poorly it sounds like one of my fellow attorney colleagues did in representing your son in the case that he had, because while we do have a rich and robust no fault system and a wraparound protection that an insured individual in Michigan is entitled to under the law, if someone doesn't understand their rights, they can't access that system effectively. And it's particularly disappointing to hear that you, in fact, were represented by someone who had a law license who didn't apparently understand the basics of the no fault system. So while I can't do anything about it today, I would encourage anyone who wants information about the no fault system, we have a vast amount of information at the Office of Financial Insurance Regulation, both on-line and we have a toll free call center that people can call in and get all kinds of information. It's very unfortunate to hear about someone

Τ	who has a serious injury, avails themself of legal
2	representation and then has a practitioner who,
3	unfortunately, doesn't understand, it sounds like, the
4	basics of the system. And in the end your son was the
5	person who paid the price for that for a number of years.
6	MR. SHERONY: Yes, he did.
7	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. Thank you, sir. And
8	also Mike Sherony? It says
9	MR. SHERONY: I think he decided not to.
10	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you, sir. Jason I'm
11	going to try this Theodoroff (pronouncing). How did I
12	do?
13	MR. THEODOROFF: That was pretty good.
14	MR. HOLLOWELL: All right.
15	MR. THEODOROFF: It's Theodoroff. My name is
16	J-a-s-o-n T-h-e-o-d-o-r-o-f-f. I want to thank you for
17	hearing me today.
18	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you for being here.
19	MR. THEODOROFF: I'd like to first start with
20	because I, myself, are a brain injury survivor from an
21	automobile accident I'm a recovering survivor, as they
22	say. And when it comes to recovery, the need never goes
23	away. In a split second, life can change. Mine started
24	with a broken down vehicle on the Lodge Expressway in
25	Detroit. I'm fortunate enough to be covered under the no

fault insurance policies. I can only imagine how my recovery would have taken place without it. I have been in a legal battle that has taken forever; I mean years. My one legal battle actually just resolved not long too ago here. That was -- it was filed back in December -- right after my accident in December of '02. It didn't finally even go to trial until June of '07. So I was waiting for quite awhile for that. Would you want to have to go to court and spend the next couple of years fighting to receive rehabilitation that might help some, if not all of your functioning? That's my question I pose to the panel. Because I certainly wouldn't want to. And if you have to, it's a tragedy. Now, you may not suffer from a traumatic brain injury like myself, but try to put yourself into my shoes or the shoes of future victims, who would have no means of paying for recovery or even taking care of themselves. I'm referring to the PIP benefits. I personally am incredibly blessed to be receiving the core kind of care and treatment that I get. I had to learn how to walk and talk all over again. reason that I'm having such hope for my life is totally dependent on the no fault and PIP benefits that are allocated to me. The small amount of money drivers spend for PIP may just keep your life somewhat normal in the future. I mean it's such a small amount, like \$160 a year. That 160 a year, think about what it provides to you. I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

mean people say "Oh, yeah, we want to take that out to help lower our bills." But that 160, having that protection, I mean you can spend a lot of money. And I was charged something like \$50,000 coverage, well, it's good to say that my first -- I was in two hospitals. The first hospital I was in, I was only there for -- I shouldn't say "only there." I was there a month before I transferred. That was a couple hundred thousand right there.

MR. HOLLOWELL: I'm sorry. So it was a couple hundred thousand for how long?

MR. THEODOROFF: For a -- for a month's care right there. And then after all the treatment -- I'm still receiving treatment. I mean I spent well over a million dollars. And the problem I have is that this PIP choice will let you purchase what you think you want in protection. But tell me, how do you really know what you want or what you need. I mean that's like playing -- that's gambling with your life, in a sense. And myself, who had a drunk and drive to gamble with all this; this is the same idea with the PIP choice, you're gambling with your life. Do I buy this much protection or do I buy that much protection. I want our legislature to know that if they didn't have the cushy government benefits, that they'd be subject to the same scenario if it ever happened to them. I'm -- I'm just saying that, because I understand the benefits package that

1	are allotted to lawmakers is pretty pretty generous. And
2	people may say that they don't want to live in Michigan
3	because of all the troubles we have and everything, but
4	would they but would they really say that if they got
5	into a serious car accident and they needed treatment? The
6	fact is, I'd be happy if I was going to come to Michigan,
7	because you know you're going to get the treatment needed.
8	And people need to know that broken bones heal, but spinal
9	cord and brain injuries are for life. Until they find some
10	measures where they take your brain and automatically go
11	back to its normal form, it's going to be there. And life
12	can be a long time. Thank you.
13	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you so much. Any questions?
14	MR. GAFFNEY: I have one question. How did you
15	hear about the hearing today?
16	MR. THEODOROFF: I heard about the hearing today
17	because I'm also a member of the Eisenhower Center, and I
18	was asked if I would come here and speak with you guys
19	today.
20	MR. GAFFNEY: Thank you for doing that. Thank you
21	for doing so.
22	MR. THEODOROFF: Well, thank you.
23	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. Mr. Commissioner?
24	MR. ROSS: Thank you.

MR. HOLLOWELL: We appreciate it very much, Mr.

1 Theodoroff.

2 MR. THEODOROFF: Thank you.

3 MR. HOLLOWELL: Next we'll hear from -- we've got

4 a little over ten minutes -- Ken Judge. Mr. Judge?

5 MR. JUDGE: I'm Ken Judge. Hi. I'm Ken Judge.

J-u-d-g-e.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: Just take your time.

MR. JUDGE: I am -- I am going to have no fault insurance because I need it to go through school, attend the therapies to learn how to walk again and relearn how to do my ADLs. No fault also helped me to work so that I can be productive and make money. Yeah, mucho money. I have also met a lot of people on my way to recovery, like Scott Battaba (phonetic) who used to be the president of the Eisenhower Center, and his wife Connie Battaba, who was my PC right when I got there. And then I also met Jess Ferdad (phonetic) and John Cornack, who is in the back, who is the president. And now where are we? Because the staff -because they're doing the right thing for us. Also I am glad to have met the staff that do this, because they feel better when they make us feel good. Yeah! If people didn't have no fault as it is now, they could -- they could not have these things. And now another thing from Bill Cosby. I would like everyone to stand up and hold hands. Please.

MR. HOLLOWELL: You want everyone to stand up and

1	hold hands?
2	MR. JUDGE: Yeah. That's what yeah. I mean
3	this is a good thing.
4	MR. HOLLOWELL: Do you know what? Why not?
5	(Audience and hearing panel stand and hold hands)
6	MR. JUDGE: All right. Then this here is my
7	family. Thank you.
8	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you. Very nice. Very nice
9	Mr. Judge. And, you know, you said for a moment that the
10	staff and those who were working with you make you feel
11	good. You make me feel good, so thank you for doing that.
12	I don't think I've ever seen anything like that happen at a
13	public hearing like this, but I'm glad it happened. I
14	appreciate you very much. And our last speaker will be John
15	Cornack.
16	MR. CORNACK: Hi. My name is John Cornack.
17	J-o-h-n C-o-r-n-a-c-k. One of the reasons we're up here at
18	Marquette is because I'm a Northern Michigan University
19	graduate.
20	MR. HOLLOWELL: All right. You're at home.
21	MR. CORNACK: Yeah. And when some of the folks
22	heard I was coming back home, they wanted to come and they
23	wanted to say their piece. And Michael obviously lives
24	here, and that was wonderful to hear his story, because we

live these stories every day.

1 MR. HOLLOWELL: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CORNACK: And what I love most about who you just listened to or the people that have been harmed is -- and you may not know this, but acquired brain injury or traumatic brain injury at one time was considered the silent epidemic.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Spinal cord or brain?

MR. CORNACK: Brain injury.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Brain. The silent epidemic?

MR. CORNACK: Yeah. It's not silent any longer.

I've come to all the hearings now. This is my fourth one.

I haven't spoke, because I want to listen to other people.

I think listening is important. You only fix things if you

listen long enough to know what they want. And I've found

out that we have a wonderful auto no fault insurance

coverage here. It's something we have to find a way to make

affordable to all people, but it's something that's working

and it's the premiere service in the country. And it really

protects our people against catastrophic loss. In my world,

catastrophic loss is all around me, thankfully, because I

get to take care of folks that matter. I'm not so worried

about the car; I'm more worried about the families that were

in the hospital the night of the accident, I'm worried about

what they were praying and what they were hoping for. And I

get to be there for their children and their loved ones now.

Putting people at the forefront is what Michigan auto insurance does, and I think that's what it should be. The car is nice to have, but it's not all that expendable. Who cares if you have it one day or gone the next. We can get back into the horse and buggy, to answer your question. If we can't afford auto no-fault, I'd rather run to work or get to -- or buy a bike. With safer cars, declining claims and higher profits to the insurance companies, why shouldn't insurance premiums go down? Now, I know PIP did the last year or so; right? It went down from a year ago from 118 to 106 or 105.

MR. HOLLOWELL: 104.

MR. CORNACK: Thank you. And thank you for that reduction, insurance companies. Really what's being asked of us is to trade, okay, to gamble things. And really that's what makes me the most nervous. If I'm nervous about anything about this presentation, it's because I'm a spokesperson that is trading or gambling, because I'm part of CPAN, which is the Coalition to Protect Auto No Fault. That's a lot of responsibility. I don't want to harm anyone's future, I don't want to harm the next people who get injured. I want to make sure we keep these really strong benefits. They want us to cap PIP, they want us to go to work comp fees and they want us to reduce fraud. And that's nice. And I think we all want to make sure that auto

insurance is affordable, and that we can do it without harming their future, but capping PIP at \$50,000, like you said, would give one of our clients to one hospital, but wouldn't afford it to get to the second. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In one of the hearings, it was stated that -- from the insurance side, they said we believe that if we could get these trades, we believe we bring better rates. Well, the word "believe" is our next word, isn't it? It's just like "affordable" or any other word. What's going to be the definition of believe. We try? And really from our perspective, it's about shifting risk back to the consumer, back to the state. If auto no fault goes away or if we put PIP benefits on -- if we top them out at \$50,000, eventually those folks are going to go bankrupt, eventually those folks will have to -- not go through the health care system at They'll be forced into skilled nursing, spend down their assets, get on the Medicaid system, and the state ends up with it anyway. So we really have to be cautious about our decisions, and I think we do have to come to the middle. I don't think there's any clear-cut answer, I don't think -you know, some of our environments need help. I think you mentioned Detroit and Saginaw and Flint. So I thought that when we were talking about affordability, I thought some of our talks have switched to really kind of carving up costs or line item vetoes, where we just don't want to pay for

this anymore. And I think what we need to do is management. I enjoyed the case manager up here, because we have a lot of pressure from case managers about keeping, you know, our clinical pathway strong. We always have to be helping someone. We can't just have them live with us, so we have case managers to say "We need to do this, we need to move this forward, we need to get them into a more independent environment and saving costs." So that pressure is always out here for us. For the providers of services, we always have that pressure, and so we're always trying to move that forward. And really you have to pardon our passion a little bit.

MR. HOLLOWELL: I like passion.

MR. CORNACK: On our provider's side, we get to help people smile again. We get to help people move forward in their life. We get them jobs, we make sure that they have a quality of life, and that's just something you can be passionate about. The answer to the question -- you offered this question to one of the people "Would you pay for PIP?" And I think everyone in Michigan should have to come work for an environment where there is a catastrophic event to an environment, because if you ever worked in an emergency room or in a rehab center, you would find that the PIP is well worth the value. I mean it really opens your eyes to what could happen to your loved ones or to your neighbor, and I'm

really willing to pay PIP now and forever as long as we get to repair lives. It works for me. I think what we can do, Mr. Ross, Commissioner Ross, is really, you know, empower you. I would just love -- I love the fact that you bring balance, that that's what you could bring to us, to make sure that the auto no fault stays silent and balanced. need to get it back to simple. We've made this very difficult even to talk about. We need to get the legislation involved. I know there's a lot of commissioners; I go to the committees. And they're frustrated, even within the committee, so we need to start bringing some kind of real information to them, and let's make some changes and some differences. And we need to allow you to monitor kind of how rates are set and what are some of those parameters that they're setting the rates with. I've sat in all of these meetings and I've sat in the other committee meetings, and they really don't quite understand what credit means yet. I know it's not my personal credit, but it's a grouping of things. So it's my income and it's education level and it's my driving record and it's all sorts of things. I'd like to make that simple as well. Do I drive well, do I drive slowly, do I get in accidents, do I park my car, do I lock it, and have my rate based on that. And we really do need to do one other thing. We need to inform the consumers of what they could lose,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	because, again, this is this is very serious business.
2	We don't want to lose something this precious. And that's
3	all I have for you today.
4	MR. HOLLOWELL: That's very good. Thank you. Any
5	questions?
6	MR. ROSS: I'm sorry, Mr. Cornack. I didn't
7	catch I got that you were part of the provider community,
8	but I didn't catch what particular part.
9	MR. CORNACK: CPAN, Coalition to Prevent Auto No
10	Fault.
11	MR. ROSS: What do you do?
12	MR. CORNACK: With them I am the co-chair of the
13	governing body.
14	MR. ROSS: And what do you do professionally?
15	MR. CORNACK: I am the president of Eisenhower
16	Center. It's a traumatic brain injury rehab center in Ann
17	Arbor, Michigan.
18	MR. ROSS: Okay. So you mentioned a couple
19	things, but I'd like to pose the same question to you that I
20	did to Mr. Smith at the beginning, which is someone in your
21	position, I suspect, has insights into the mechanics of the
22	system on a daily basis over a period of time. So if you
23	could give us any insight that you have on ways that you
24	think the system may be made more efficient or improved in

any way, I'd be interested in hearing about those.

MR. CORNACK: I think consistency in case
management would would help. You know, like he had
stated, you know, up here the case manager is 150 miles
away, so a lot of that is going to be done on the phone.
But down in the Ann Arbor, Detroit, Grand Rapids, Bay City
area, the case managers are at every team meeting. And
consistency with their communication and the adjusters of
the insurance companies.

MR. ROSS: Do you think it would be beneficial to have mandatory independent case managers who would have the ability to both balance the interests of the individual and the insurance company's interests, in the sense of deciding with the practicing team what the best strategy is to address the injured person's needs?

MR. CORNACK: Like they do in a court system?

MR. ROSS: Well, something that's not quasijudicial, but that's designed to both protect the system's
interest and not having redundant care, but also protect the
individual's interest in getting a robust set of services to
essentially replace what you would get in a lawsuit.

MR. CORNACK: I think when we're talking to case managers, I think they always bring that to the table, to have a third party -- not that you want to add another layer of communicator. Because many of the case managers work for the insurance company already. You're now putting in a

1	third another party. On some of the heavier cases, it
2	makes all the sense in the world. If you especially if
3	you've heard there's a problem with this case or payment or
4	whatever, or they're not moving a case forward from a
5	catastrophic perspective.

MR. ROSS: But on the flip side of it as well, from the company's perspective, would it be helpful in providing a uniformity of treatment, as well as not providing necessarily access to things that would be, perhaps, a possibility, but not a reasonable enough possibility of providing effective care to that person?

MR. CORNACK: It would probably help make it more stable, as far as the -- but a lot of the direction is given from the physician, from the physical medicine and rehabilitation professionals, so even the folks who come to the table take a great deal of direction just from the physician.

MR. HOLLOWELL: If I could follow-up on that question. So you said that would make it more stable. Does that translate into help make it less costly?

MR. CORNACK: It -- it could. I mean if they were looking at the same factors. The issue with catastrophic loss in our case is they are all so diversely different.

MR. HOLLOWELL: Anything further, Mr. Commissioner? Okay.

1	MR. GAFFNEY: Is the Eisenhower Center both an
2	inpatient and an outpatient facility?
3	MR. CORNACK: We're residential we're vastly
4	more residential than we are outpatient, but we do deal with
5	outpatients as well.
б	MR. GAFFNEY: And give us your opinion, please,
7	about the idea of putting a worker's comp style payment
8	scheme into PIP?
9	MR. CORNACK: Worker comp payment, how we're
10	how we have our operations now, it might drop some of our
11	services as far as level of supervision, is what we call it,
12	and so we're very careful how we monitor our clients. And
13	by dropping to a to a work comp scale would mean that
14	we're also dropping staff to make that break even.
15	MR. GAFFNEY: Does your facility deal with
16	individuals who are on the worker's comp system now?
17	MR. CORNACK: Yes, we have some.
18	MR. GAFFNEY: Okay. So you are a pretty good
19	person to compare the two?
20	MR. CORNACK: Yes.
21	MR. GAFFNEY: Okay. Thank you.
22	MR. CARLSON: But it's very difficult on those
23	cases, because, again, the risk to the clients are what we
24	monitor the most closely. And then they would also cut some
25	of the other things that we provide, which is quality of

life issues. Getting into the community, because that -- we want rehab to happen both in our -- within our center, but we want it to happen out where life happens.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLOWELL: Mr. Commissioner?

MR. ROSS: I think that's a really good point, though, that you make, that since you deal with both populations, that it is a delicate balance and is a tough choice, but I think -- you know, I'm interested in the longterm stability of the system, and I think we're getting to a point where we're going to start needing to make some tough decisions, because the system as it exists today, whether you view it from the perspective of insurance companies are making too much profit or you view it from the perspective of the benefit package is too rich, it's clear that in some areas of our state it's just unaffordable. And there's large portions of the population that are just opting out of the system, and our system really doesn't work with large segments of the population not covered. And so I think it's very interesting to hear that, because we are going to have to start making some tough decisions, and I'm interested in understanding the ways that we can make those in a nuanced way that provides and maintains as robust a package as possible to the vast majority of the folks.

MR. CORNACK: One of the major drawbacks to the work comp environment is that if we reduce our staffing

1	levels, remember you're now harming the health care
2	industry, which is our strongest industry. And so you have
3	to really make sure you maintain a balance, and I think that
4	is going to be difficult for us all to work out. Because
5	you don't want to lose policies because you're not employing
6	people to work in the health care field. And that's a huge
7	issue, especially to the major centers, to the major
8	hospitals. This is not an insignificant issue to them, and
9	they should be probably the people presenting this.
10	MR. HOLLOWELL: You know, you said the word
11	"balance," and that's it struck me as an insightful,
12	maybe, way to think about this. So thank you for your
13	testimony. It's been very, very helpful.
14	MR. CORNACK: Thank you.
15	MR. HOLLOWELL: Mr. Commissioner, Mr. President,
16	any other questions?
17	MR. GAFFNEY: Thank you.
18	MR. HOLLOWELL: Thank you very much. We're just
19	out of time, but I did want to read to you the results of
20	the audience poll.
21	To question number one. Have your auto insurance rates
22	gone down in the last two years? Yes, 29 percent; no, 50
23	percent; don't know, 21 percent.

Two. Should insurance companies be able to keep their

privilege of being able to raise rates without first being

24

reviewed and approved by the State Insurance Commissioner?

Yes, 21 percent; no, 71 percent; don't know, 7 percent.

Three. Should insurance companies be allowed to use your credit history, your occupation and your level of education in setting your rate? Yes, 36 percent; no, 57 percent; don't know, 0.

Four. Should insurance companies be allowed to sell your personal information to third party marketing partners, a practice called data mining? Yes, 0 percent; no, 93 percent; don't know, 7 percent.

Five. Nationally insurance company profits are at their highest levels in U.S. history. Should excess profits be used to lower premiums? Yes, 64 percent; no, 14 percent; don't know, 21 percent.

Six. Should the State Insurance Commissioner be allowed to issue refunds to the public if he or she finds companies have overcharged the public? Yes, 71 percent; no, 21 percent; don't know, 7 percent.

Seven. If you did not have access to an automobile, could you get to work by public transportation? Yes, 29 percent; no, 50 percent; don't know, 7 percent.

Eight. If you did not have access to an automobile, would this limit your future employment prospects? Yes, 43 percent; no, 36 percent; don't know, 7 percent.

So I want to again thank you so much for taking the

Т	time out of your day to be here. We're truly grateful, and
2	we will put this information into an annual report. You
3	should know that the transcripts to the hearing and all the
4	Exhibits will be made available free of charge to the public
5	on our web site. And, with that, the hearing is adjourned.
6	Thank you.
7	(Hearing adjourned at 6:10 p.m.)
8	-0-0-0-
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	